



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1301 CONSTITUTION AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

DATE: APRIL 20, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2016-ADM-0097

CROSS REFERENCE #: HOTLINE COMP
2017-0212

TITLE: UNKNOWN SUBJECT, WILLIAMS JEFFERSON CLINTON (WJC) WEST
BUILDING ROOFTOP GARDEN

CASE SUMMARY REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
UNKNOWN SUBJECT	WASHINGTON, DC	

COMPLAINT:

On April 12, 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Office of Investigations (OI), Office of the Inspector General (OIG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), received information via an email that the lock on the William Jefferson Clinton (WJC) West Building rooftop door appeared to have been deliberately broken. The rooftop had been accessed several days earlier by employees who were directed to remove a rooftop garden from the area. On April 19, 2017, Special Agent (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA OIG Hotline, opened a hotline complaint on this matter.

BACKGROUND:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was approached by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Facilities Management and Services Division (FMSD), and told the lock on the WJC-West building rooftop had been broken. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) then forwarded (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) an email and pictures with additional information [Attachments 1-3].

Due to the Easter/Passover holiday (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (FMSD), was unavailable at the time the damaged lock was found. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) returned to the office, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) quickly contacted OIG special agents. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that locks on WJC East and West were not damaged and the whole matter was simply a misunderstanding. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (Office of Water), had been given permission to access the roof to remove gardening materials. On April 7, 2017, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) left WJC-West rooftop door unlocked and secured the East side. The West door was

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

left open for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (FMSD), found what appeared to be damage on the West rooftop door lock and reported it to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) supervisor on April 10, 2017. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had removed the lock from the West side and there was no property damage to report.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS:

EPA OIG special agents conducted interviews with the necessary employees. Every version of the story was slightly different. The interviews revealed that a simple lack of communication resulted in the report of property damage being made to the OIG. The investigation revealed there was no criminal wrongdoing in this matter.

RECOMMENDATION:

The investigation revealed that the allegation of property damage is not supported.

This case is recommended for closure with no further investigatory action.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Hotline Complaint.



2017-0212
referral.pdf

2. Email to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



Email.FW_ East and
West Rooftop Gard

3. Email to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) re: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)



Email.FW_ WJC
West rooftop garde



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

TWO POTOMAC YARD
2733 SOUTH CRYSTAL DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

DATE: MAY 25, 2017

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0110

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: UNKNOWN SUBJECT - DESTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
N/A	EPA	

VIOLATIONS(s):

Title 18 United States Code Section 1361; Destruction Of Government Property

ALLEGATIONS: On May 11, 2017, Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), Washington Field Office, was referred EPA OIG Hotline complaint 2017-0264. The request to the hotline was an allegation of destruction of property in room (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) William Jefferson Clinton Building, South on May 4, 2017. The subject may be an unknown Office of Environment and Compliance Assurance employee.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS: On various dates, SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) spoke telephonically with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Office of Acquisition and Resource Management and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Office of Federal Activities (OFA), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Both stated to SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) that EPA employee (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) unscrewed the light bulbs due to the brightness of the them. Additionally, the brightness of the lights (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). Since the incident was reported to EPA OIG the lights have been replaced and are currently fully functional.

DISPOSITION: Not Supported; Closed.

The allegation that an EPA employee destroyed lights in an EPA office was not supported. Therefore, it is recommended this case be closed.

As such, this case is being closed with no further action.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
1445 ROSS AVENUE, SUITE 1200
DALLAS, TX 75202

CASE #: OI-DA-2017-CAC-0021

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: [REDACTED] - EMAIL THREAT TO EPA ADMINISTRATOR

CASE AGENT: [REDACTED]

SIGNIFICANT INCIDENT REPORT

NARRATIVE:

On November 2, 2016, [REDACTED], Office of Investigations, (OI) Office of Inspector General, (OIG) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Dallas, Texas, received an email from Special Agent [REDACTED], [REDACTED], regarding an email threat [REDACTED], private citizen, [REDACTED] Texas, sent to Gina McCarthy, EPA Administrator. The email stated the following:

“---Original Message-- From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]@gmail.com] sent Thursday, October 27, 2016, 9:10 PM To: McCarthy, Gina McCarthy.Gina@epa.gov Subject: Ban glyphosate or die you haggard nazi bitch! DIEDIEDIEDIEDIEDIEDIE.”

[REDACTED] continued in [REDACTED] email explaining the harmful use of glyphosate. [REDACTED]'s email ended with “Thank you, [REDACTED] US, [REDACTED]. This investigation is being opened because it is within the OIG’s jurisdiction to investigate threats against EPA employees. The potential violations is but not limited to 18 U.S.C 875 (Interstate Communication); 18 U.S.C. 115(a)(2) (Influencing, impeding, or retaliating against a Federal official by threatening).

On November 10, 2016, [REDACTED] verbally presented this case to Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Investigator [REDACTED], on behalf of ADA John Best for prosecution consideration concerning the aforementioned Texas Penal Codes.

On November 14, 2016, [REDACTED] sent [REDACTED] an email stating ADA Best reviewed the case background information (b) (5) [REDACTED].

Attachment(s):

None



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: December 21, 2016

PREPARED BY: [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-NE-2017-CAC-0029

CROSS REFERENCE #: Hotline 2017-0039

TITLE: POTENTIAL THREAT - LETTER SENT TO EPA ADMINISTRATOR

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	N/A

VIOLATION(S):

18 U.S.C 875 - Interstate Communication

ALLEGATION:

On November 4, 2016, [REDACTED], United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), New York, NY was telephonically contacted by [REDACTED], [REDACTED] EPA Region 1, Boston, MA relative to a potential threat sent in a letter to Gina McCarthy, EPA Administrator, Washington, DC. [REDACTED] was relaying information provided by [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Security and Sustainable Operations, EPA Region 1, Boston, MA. [REDACTED] had not seen the letter prior to contacting OI but had advised [REDACTED] to contact EPA CID, FPS, and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] sent [REDACTED] an email indicating the following: "Attached is a letter that was received by the agency as controlled correspondence, It was forwarded to the region from HQ for response. A recipient at EPA then forwarded it to me to review given the nature of the content. I have spoken with CID who is also coordinating with [REDACTED] for the Administrator's visit to Boston this evening. I would defer to your expertise as to whether there is anything concerning here that we should be mindful of. Please advise."

FINDINGS:

A preliminary review of the letter revealed that it was postmarked on October 28, 2016 from [REDACTED]. The letter was from [REDACTED], email address – [REDACTED]. The letter was addressed to "EPA Chief Gina McCarthy" and reportedly contained a courtesy copy of an Environmental [REDACTED] Report on an enclosed compact disk. The letter also mentioned [REDACTED] Governor of the State of

[REDACTED] The letter was reviewed by [REDACTED] and Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED], neither of whom saw any actual threat to the Administrator or EPA entity in the letter itself. The contents of the letter seemed to be rambling by the writer and full of disjointed thoughts.

On November 7, 2016, SA [REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] spoke with the JTTF TFO ([REDACTED] State Police) who interviewed the subject in the summer of 2015. SA [REDACTED] learned the following relative to the subject:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- -During the interview, [REDACTED]
- The TFO stated that [REDACTED] conducted the interview at the subject's home and saw no weapons, or anything else of concern.
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- The TFO does not believe that the subject poses any threat to anyone.

On December 9, 2016, OI reviewed the results [REDACTED] [REDACTED] were negative.

On December 15, 2016, OI provided (via email) [REDACTED], [REDACTED] Protection Services Detail (PSD), EPA-OECA-OCEFT with an update on this matter. Specifically, that the letter was reviewed by [REDACTED] and SA [REDACTED], neither of whom saw any actual threat to the Administrator or EPA entity in the letter itself. The contents

of the letter seemed to be rambling by the writer and full of disjointed thoughts. Further, that the subject had been interviewed previously by the FBI in the summer of 2015 on another matter and at that time they did not believe that the subject posed any threat to anyone. Finally, [REDACTED] yielded negative results. [REDACTED] was advised that a photo of the subject may be obtained [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] believed there was an ongoing threat that warrants it. [REDACTED] was advised that OI intended to close this matter. On this same day, [REDACTED] replied that no photo was needed at this time and "Thank you [REDACTED]. Greatly appreciated."

DISPOSITION:

Based on the information detailed above, SA [REDACTED]'s conversation with the JTTF TFO that conducted an initial investigation and interview with the subject, [REDACTED] the inability to discern any actual threat in the mailing received by Region 1, and the response from PSD, OI will be closing this matter at this time. The matter may be reopened if future correspondence from the subject is received.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: JULY 26, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-ADM-0095

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: UNKNOWN SUBJECTS: INCIDENT AT MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, DC

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
Unknown	WASHINGTON D.C.	

VIOLATION:

DC Code-22-3302- Unlawful entry on property.

ALLEGATION:

On April 7, 2017, the Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector (OIG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), initiated a criminal investigation after receiving a complaint that two unknown protestors attempted to disrupt EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt's speech during a closed conference held by the Environmental Council of States (ECOS) at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington D.C.

FINDINGS:

Concerning the allegation that the unidentified protestors violated DC Code-22-3302- Unlawful Entry on Property, there is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the unidentified individuals violated DC Code-22-3302- Unlawful Entry on Property.

On April 19th, 2017, during an interview with OI Special Agents, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Environmental Counsel of the States (ECOS) stated that the unidentified individuals who disrupted Administrator Pruitt's speech did not register for the event or pay the registration fee of \$700.00 to \$900.00 to attend the event.

DISPOSITION:

On May 8, 2017, the facts of the case were presented to the Misdemeanor Section, District of Columbia, United States Attorney's Office (USAO) for criminal violations of DC Code-22-3302- Unlawful entry on property. After being presented with the facts, the USAO declined prosecution due (b) (5), (b) (7)(E).

Based upon the foregoing and in consultation with the Office of Counsel, OIG EPA, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

1301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 200042

DATE: March 27, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-HQ-2017-CAC-0059

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); THREAT

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	Beckley, WV	

VIOLATION(S):

Title 18 U.S.C. Section 111

Assaulting, resisting, or impeding certain officers or employees

ALLEGATION:

On January 19, 2017, Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), Washington Field Office, was notified by OI Special Agent in Charge (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) of an alleged threat directed towards (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), an EPA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). After the sentencing of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) for a violation of the Clean Water Act, an individual later identified as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) entered an elevator with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and EPA Criminal Investigation Division SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). When inside the elevator, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) "I hope to see you again real soon." Emphasizing the real soon. SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) if (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knew the person late identified as (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as the elevator doors were closing and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated "no" and said, "I think I was just threatened."

FINDINGS:

On January 20, 2017, Special Agents from the EPA OIG and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not mean for (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) comment to be taken as threatening (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) just wanted to "tell (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) side" to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and that looking back on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) actions, it was not the time or place to say anything. If (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had known how (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) statement towards (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was perceived, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) would not have made the statement.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) . apologized for (b) (6) actions and stated (b) (6) would not seek out (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to communicate with (b) (6) and if (b) (6) ever encountered (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6) would avoid (b) (6) .

On January 28, 2017, EPA OIG was notified by the FBI that the assigned AUSA from the Southern District of West Virginia declined prosecution of this matter due to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), (b) (5), (b) (7)(E)

DISPOSITION: Inconclusive; Closed

This matter involving a potential threat was declined by the AUSA for the Southern District of West Virginia. Therefore, this case is now closed.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: March 8, 2017

PREPARED BY: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-NE-2013-CAC-0086

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: UNKNOWN SUBJECT: SUSPICIOUS MATERIAL FOUND IN EPA REGIONAL OFFICE

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
UNKNOWN SUBJECT	EPA Region 2 Office, New York, NY	

VIOLATIONS:

TITLE 18 USC SEC 111 - Assaulting, resisting, or impeding certain officers or employees

ALLEGATION:

On February 7, 2013, OI was made aware of a white powdery substance found on an EPA employee's desk at 290 Broadway, New York, NY.

FINDINGS:

Response by the Federal Protective Service (FPS) resulted in the clearing of the potential hazmat incident as unfounded. Additional testing confirmed that the material did not present any potential hazard.

Subsequent investigation, with the assistance of FPS, to include multiple interviews failed to identify any individual who may have left the white powder. Interviews did reveal that the incident was an apparent internal employee matter and the material in the bag appeared to be some variety of deodorizer and was left at that location due to complaints regarding offensive odors in the office.

This matter was subsequently declined for prosecution by the US Attorney's Office Southern District of New York because (b) (5), (b) (7)(E).

DISPOSITION:

Based on the fact that this investigation failed to identify who left the white powder, the white powder was determined to be harmless, the white powder appeared to be the result of an interpersonal conflict and not a potential threat, and decision by the AUSA SDNY office which declined advancing the matter, no further action, including civil or administrative proceedings, will be taken by OI. Therefore, this case will be closed.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
290 BROADWAY, ROOM 1520
NEW YORK, NY 10007

DATE: MAY 4, 2017

PREPARED BY: SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

CASE #: OI-NE-2014-ADM-0106

CROSS REFERENCE #: HOTLINE 2014-190

TITLE: UNKNOWN SUBJECT(S) -- EPA REGION 2 MANAGEMENT ALLEGEDLY ALTERED DOCUMENTS

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)	EPA REGION 2 290 BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10007	(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

COMPLAINT:

On July 10, 2014, Resident Agent in Charge (RAC) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations, New York Resident Office (NYRO), was provided with EPA OIG Hotline Complaint Number 2014-190 by Special Agent (SA) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA OIG-OI, Headquarters.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C), American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) Local 3911, New York, NY contacted the EPA OIG Hotline and alleged that EPA Region 2 Management altered documents relative to negligence on behalf of an EPA employee. Specifically, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) alleged that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) EPA Region 2, engaged in actions that put EPA inspectors at risk during specific inspections. It was further alleged that EPA management was aware of this and deliberately altered documents to cover up the exposure of EPA inspectors to perchloroethylene, a possible carcinogen. The majority of the documentation provided in the complaint was supplied by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

BACKGROUND:

On July 23, 2014, RAC (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) conducted an interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to gather additional information related to the allegations against (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). According to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) failed to provide proper respiratory protection for EPA inspectors while inspecting dry cleaning machines, which exposed them to dangerous levels of perchloroethylene (perc). The EPA inspectors exposed to the dangerous levels of perc were (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

(b) (6) indicated (b) (6) was one of the inspectors that brought the exposure issue to the attention of (b) (6). (b) (6) informed (b) (6) that New York State Inspectors were wearing full faced respirators (with removable filters) during the inspections of the same dry cleaning machines, and expressed some apprehension because the EPA Inspectors were not donning the same protective gear. (b) (6) stated (b) (6) did not seem too concerned and told (b) (6) (b) (6) could wear one if (b) (6) was afraid.

It was suspected by the AFGE that (b) (6) altered an e-mail from (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) 2011, which directly addressed the issues concerning the lack of respiratory protection for the EPA Inspectors. However, the original and unaltered document was obtained by the AFGE on (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), the same day in which (b) (6) retired from the EPA.

(b) (6) explained (b) (6) left the agency (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had also retired from the EPA. (b) (6) also believed that two inspectors from the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) were similarly exposed to high levels of perchloroethylene but (b) (6) did not know their names.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS:

On January 17, 2017, the investigation was transferred to SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA OIG-OI, NYRO.

On February 2, 2017, SA (b) (6) contacted (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), EPA Region 2, to obtain confirmation that those involved are no longer employed with the EPA.4

On May 2, 2017, SA (b) (6) conducted an interview of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) regarding the redacted documents. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6) was the individual who created the redactions for this request because the original e-mails involved deliberative communications between management. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) reaffirmed that this document was redacted based on this and because the AFGE probably did not meet the standard to obtain all of the information they were seeking. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) said that any AFGE request for information has to specify a particular need as to why they want the information. In addition, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated responses to such requests typically contain redacted data because they contain confidential or personal information, or they included deliberative dialogue between management officials.

RECOMMENDATION:

This investigation did not uncover any evidence to support the allegation that management deliberately altered documents in order to conceal Agency misconduct. Based upon the results of the investigation it appears the redactions were done so in accordance with appropriate Federal Labor Law guidelines. As a result, there will be no further action taken in this case, and the investigation will be closed.